

NEIFELD DOCKET NO: ANIT0018U-US

USPTO CONFIRMATION NO: 9844

Application/Patent No:09/226,597

File/Issue Date: 1/7/1999

Inventor/title: Pimentel/Weight Control Using An Anti-Lapse Antibody

Examiner/ArtUnit: Gailene Gabel/1641

37 CFR 1.111AMENDMENT

ASSISTANT COMMISSION FOR PATENT

Sir: In response to the NON FINAL office action in this application mailed 2/9/2007 and further to the notice of non-compliant amendment mailed August 2, 2007, the applicant files this response.

## Table of Contents

<u>IN THE CLAIMS</u> .....	<u>6</u>
<u>REMARKS</u> .....	<u>11</u>
I. SUMMARY OF THE OFFICE ACTION .....	<u>11</u>
II. SUMMARY OF CLAIMS .....	<u>11</u>
III. RESPONSE TO CLAIM OBJECTIONS .....	<u>11</u>
IV. SUMMARY OF REJECTIONS WITHDRAWN .....	<u>12</u>
V. REJECTION OF CLAIMS AS INDEFINITE UNDER 35 USC 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH	<u>12</u>
A. Claim 3 .....	<u>12</u>
B. Claim 12 .....	<u>17</u>
C. Claims 20 and 21 .....	<u>17</u>
D. Claims 34, 35, and 42 .....	<u>18</u>
VI. THE WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103 BASED UPON LECLERCQ .....	<u>19</u>
VII. THE CURRENT OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS BASED UPON COOK AND LECLERCQ	<u>19</u>
A. The Obviousness Rejections Are Improper Because Cook (USP 5,919,451) is Not Prior Art .....	<u>20</u>
1. The Proof of Actual Reduction To Practice Not Later Than July 7, 1997 .....	<u>20</u>
2. The 35 USC 102 Prior Art Date of the Cook Patent .....	<u>21</u>
B. The Obviousness Rejections are Improper Because Cook and LeClercQ Do not Suggest What is Claimed .....	<u>28</u>
1. The Teachings of the Cook USP 5,919,451 Patent .....	<u>28</u>
2. THE TEACHINGS OF LECLERCQ .....	<u>30</u>
3. THE COMBINED TEACHINGS OF COOK AND LECLERCQ .....	<u>30</u>
4. SECONDARY INDICIA OF NON OBVIOUSNESS .....	<u>31</u>
a. The Conclusions Reached by the Examiner of USP 5,725,873 are Contrary to the Obviousness Conclusion Reached by the Examiner in this Application .....	<u>32</u>

b.	There is Additional Objective Evidence Supporting the Conclusion Efficacy of Feeding AntiBodies to CCK to affect metabolism did not Provide a Reasonable Expectation of Success for any Other Nutrition Related Factor . . . . .	<u>34</u>
VIII.	THE PROVISIONAL NON-STATUTORY DOUBLE PATENT REJECTIONS . . . . .	<u>36</u>
IX.	EVIDENCE IN THIS APPLICATION . . . . .	<u>40</u>